



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,495	07/02/2003	Tientch Chen	200209928-1	4418
22879 7590 04/14/2010 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration 3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528				
EXAMINER HESS, BRUCE H				
ART UNIT 1785		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 04/14/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
laura.m.clark@hp.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/613,495
Filing Date: July 02, 2003
Appellant(s): CHEN ET AL.

Carol Mintz
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed January 12, 2010 appealing from the Office action mailed October 20, 2009.

(1) Real Party in Interest

The examiner has no comment on the statement, or lack of statement, identifying by name the real party in interest in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application:

Claims 1-4, 6 and 7.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief. The IDS submitted on 03/03/2010 after the filing of the appellants' brief has been considered. The references discussed in the Japanese Search Report are not considered to be as relevant as the reference relied upon by the examiner.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office

action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

The evidence relied upon by the examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal is applicants' Declaration of 08/24/2005. The claims are rejected over applicants' statement of the prior art.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' statement of the prior art.

In their Declaration of 08/24/2005, applicants acknowledge that "Neither the composition nor the paper base used in this invention is new ...". The presence of mordants in this composition clearly identifies the composition as one that is ink receiving. Applicants further acknowledge on pages 1 and 2 of their specification that it is conventional for ink jet recording media to employ coated base papers having ink receiving layers that contain hydrophilic binders, hardening agents and mordants. Consequently, use of a known ink jet recording media base with a known ink jet

recording layer would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art in the absence of unexpected results.

(10) Response to Argument

Applicants argue that the prima facie case of obviousness established by the examiner has been overcome by a showing of unexpected results in Example 5 in their specification. The examiner acknowledges that applicants have in fact shown that unexpected results are obtained when the claimed ink receiving layer a) contains boric acid as a cross-linking agent and b) is applied to the claimed paper bases in an amount of 5.5 grams per square meter. This showing is not commensurate in scope with applicants' claims which can employ cross-linking agents other than boric acid or its salts and the receiving layer can be applied in a range of "about 3 grams per square meter to about 7 grams per square meter".

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/BRUCE H. HESS/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1785

Art Unit: 1785

Conferees:

/William Krynski/

Quality Assurance Specialist, TC1700

/Mark Ruthkosky/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1785